Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
FUREKA DIVISON

CARLOS GILBERT LAW,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEPUTY GOODEN, et. al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-4977-NJV (PR)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, has filed a pro se civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff has also filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis. Plaintiff alleges that he was assaulted on December 4, 2015, while at San Francisco County Jail. He is now incarcerated at the California Medical Facility.

The Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 ("PLRA"), enacted April 26, 1996, provides that a prisoner may not bring a civil action or appeal a civil judgment under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 "if the prisoner has, on three or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The phrase "fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted," as used in § 1915(g), "parallels the language of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6)." Andrews v. King, 398 F.3d 1113, 1121 (9th Cir. 2005) (internal quotation marks omitted). A case is "frivolous" within the meaning of § 1915(g) if "it is of little weight or importance: having no basis in law or fact." *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted). Further, because § 1915(g) is a procedural rule that does not raise

Case 1:16-cv-04977-NJV Document 6 Filed 09/19/16 Page 2 of 2

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
iia	12
liforn	13
thern District of Cal	14
	15
	16
	17
No	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26

27

28

United States District Court

retroactivity concerns, cases dismissed before the effective date of § 1915(g) may be counted as
qualifying dismissals or "strikes." See Tierney v. Kupers, 128 F.3d 1310, 1311-12 (9th Cir. 1997)
A dismissal under § 1915(g) means that a prisoner cannot proceed with his action as a pauper
under § 1915(g), but he still may pursue his claim if he pays the full filing fee at the outset of the
action.
It appears that plaintiff has at least four strikes pursuant to 8 1015(a):

It appears that plaintiff has at least four strikes pursuant to § 1915(g):

- Law v. Benitez, No. 06-1061 OWW LJO (E.D. Cal.) Docket Nos. 10, 11.
- Law v. Green, No. 07-1071 LJO DLB (E.D. Cal.) Docket Nos. 8, 10.
- Law v. Miller, No. 11-1339 LJO SKO (E.D. Cal.) Docket Nos. 13, 14.
- Law v. Domico, No. 10-2225 BAM (E.D. Cal.) Docket Nos. 18, 19.

Plaintiff shall show cause within twenty-one (21) days, why this case should not be deemed three strikes barred and the application to proceed in forma pauperis denied. Failure to reply will result in dismissal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 19, 2016

Jnited States Magistrate Judge